

## REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for participating in the case interview, during which, claims 1-6, 7, 8, 9-15, and 16-19 were discussed, in light of the references Pendakur and Moncreiff.

Claims 1, 2, 16, 19, and 20 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments can be located at pages 29-34, for example, of the specification of the present invention. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application.

On page 2 of the current Office Action, claims 1-6, 8, and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,828,839 A (Moncreiff) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,502,126 B1 (Pendakur).

Moncreiff is directed to a computer network chat room system that includes plural chat rooms. According to Moncreiff, conversation in each chat room is related to a program being broadcast in real-time over a channel in a user-defined time zone. Computer users access the chat rooms via the Internet by providing a desired television or radio channel, along with a request to enter a chat room.

Pendakur is directed to an object-oriented DVC application runtime interface (RI) including runtime management and channel objects for assisting running of customized DVC applications incorporated with prepackaged conference control objects. According to Pendakur, an object-oriented DVC application runtime synchronizer (RS) having a number of runtime management and channel objects is provided for assisting running of customized DVC applications incorporated with prepackaged conference control objects that facilitate accesses to conferencing services of GPPC applications. See Pendakur, column 1, lines 62 – 67.

On pages 3-4 of the current Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Moncreiff does not explicitly teach, “wherein said correlating is performed with processings for said transmission object or processings for a transmission object sent to the network.” The Examiner alleges, however, that Pendakur teaches, “correlating conditions relating to a transmission object with processings for said transmission object or correlating conditions relating to a network with processings for a transmission object sent to said network.”

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 2, 16, 19, and 20 are patentable over the references, as neither Moncreiff nor Pendakur, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests, “said object representing a chatroom message to be transmitted and said processings representing operations to be performed based on calculations

or analysis relating to said transmission object or to said channel," as recited in claim 1, for example.

Although Moncreiff references chatrooms, Moncrieff does not disclose or suggest processings representing operations to be performed based on calculations or analysis relating to a transmission object or to a channel, as in the present invention. Pendakur's disablement of the local DVC applications is not tantamount to or related to the processings identified in the present invention.

Further, in Pendakur, the RS relays a communication between the DVC application and the GPPC application (from Fig. 3 and Figs. 18-20 of Pendakur). For example, in Fig. 18, when the DVC application of a terminal A makes a connection request to a terminal B, the request from DVC application is notified to GPPC application via RS (S200 and S202). Therefore, what RS does is a type of relaying. The RS does not perform any processing on data received from one end to send to another end. Therefore, Pendakur does not disclose or suggest the correlating of the present invention.

In light of the foregoing, the independent claims are patentable over the references. As the dependent claims depend from the independent claims, the dependent claims are patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented for the independent claims.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2-21-06

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas  
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501